

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 1-11; and adds new Claims 12-14 without introducing any new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shibasaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0167856, hereinafter “Shibasaki”) in view of Kinebuchi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0074448, hereinafter “Kinebuchi”).

In response, independent Claim 1 is amended to correct minor formal issues, and to clarify that the recording means records the information “in accordance with instructions from the instructing means as a set of information on contents in the storage means, the set of information on the contents linked to a name of the set; and displaying means for displaying the name of the set.” These features find non-limiting support in Applicants’ disclosure as originally filed for example from p. 12, l. 20, to p. 13, l. 15, and in Fig. 1, and at p. 18, ll. 17-23. No new matter has been added.

In addition, new Claims 12-14 are added. New Claims 12-14 depend upon independent Claims 1, 7 and 11, respectively, and recite features related to the display of a list. These features find non-limiting support in Applicants’ disclosure as originally filed, for example at p. 37, ll. 16-21. No new matter has been added.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection, as discussed next.

Briefly summarizing, Applicants’ Claim 1 is directed to an information-recording apparatus. The apparatus includes receiving means for receiving a plurality of information

related to contents of a broadcast, temporary storage means for temporarily storing the plurality of information related to the contents, storage means for storing the plurality of information related to the contents, instructing means for instructing that the plurality of information related to the contents temporarily stored in the temporary storage means be recorded in the storage means, *recording means for recording at least one the plurality of the information related to the contents* stored in the temporary storage means in accordance with instructions from the instructing means *as a set of information on contents in the storage means, the set of information on the contents linked to a name of the set*; and displaying means for displaying the name of the set.

The pending Office Action confirms that the reference Shibasaki fails to teach anything related to the use of a set in response to an instruction. (Office Action, p. 4, ll. 9-11.) However, the Office Action rejects such a feature based on the teachings of Kinebuchi in his paragraphs [0066] and [0097]. The reference Kinebuchi is directed to a system to make a request for transition from a process controlled by HTTP protocol to a special process controlled by a protocol different from the HTTP protocol is made by a URL input via an information terminal 4 to a server 10, for distributing multimedia. (Kinebuchi, Abstract, Fig. 2). Kinebuchi explains that contents can be distributed by channels of the server 10 via a network, and that the contents can be formed into groups of web pages, and that the groups can distinguish between each other on a channel-by-channel basis. (Kinebuchi, ¶ [0066]). Moreover, Kinebuchi explains that content distribution can be made that is classified in different groups, and can be stored based on content-distribution designation data. (Kinebuchi, ¶ [0097]).

However, the cited passages of Kinebuchi fail to teach that the set of information on the contents is linked to a name of the set, and that a displaying means displays the name of the set, as required by Applicants' Claim 1.

Therefore, the cited passages of the applied reference Kinebuchi fail to teach every feature recited in Applicants' independent Claim 1, so that Claims 1-6 are believed to be patentably distinct over Kinebuchi. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration of the rejection based on this reference.

Independent Claims 7 and 11 recite features that are analogous to the features recited in independent Claim 1, but directed to a method (Claim 7) and a computer readable medium (Claim 11). Moreover, Claims 7 and 11 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 7 and 11, and the rejections of all associated dependent claims, are also believed to be overcome in view of the arguments regarding independent Claim 1.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-14 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Nikolaus P. Schibli, Ph.D.
Registered Patent Agent
Registration No. 56,994